

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD EARL THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case Number 04-10087-BC
Honorable Thomas L. Ludington

BAY CITY COURTHOUSE,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR "RECONSIDERATION
AND RESPONSE" AND MOTION "SEEKING AND OBTAINING
THE COURT'S APPROVAL"**

On May 18, 2004, the Court dismissed Plaintiff Edward Thomas' case with prejudice. In addition, the Court enjoined Plaintiff from filing any further lawsuits without prior Court approval. The Court reached this conclusion based on his many lawsuits that had been dismissed as frivolous, noting that Plaintiff's filing history demonstrated an abuse of the legal process and a waste of the Court's resources.

On August 16, 2006, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion for "investigation on pertinent information." On March 12, 2008, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file new cases, and he filed a supplemental brief to that motion on April 7, 2008. On April 16, 2008, he filed an additional motion to reopen or reinstate this case. On July 17, 2008, the Court denied Plaintiff's motions because it could not discern either factual or legal bases for relief. In his filings, Plaintiff variously advised the Court of his progress in understanding how to initiate cases, his interest in other pending litigation, and his positive experience of the personnel when he visited the state court in Midland, Michigan. On October 6, 2008, Plaintiff filed an "order to show cause sua sponte on justiciable

claims,” and on October 8, 2008, Plaintiff filed a “motion for reconsideration/reopen.” The Court once again found that those filings did not assert any factual or legal bases for relief, and did not warrant reopening or reinstating the case. Plaintiff advised the Court of his progress in understanding how to initiate cases, and his interest in other pending litigation.

Now before the Court are Plaintiff’s “motion for reconsideration and response,” and “motion seeking and obtaining the court’s approval,” filed October 24, 2008, and November 4, 2008, respectively. In his motions, Plaintiff has once again expressed his interest in other pending litigation, however, he has not asserted any factual or legal bases for relief.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s “motion for reconsideration and response” [Dkt. # 19] and “motion seeking and obtaining the court’s approval” [Dkt. # 20] are **DENIED**.

s/Thomas L. Ludington
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
United States District Judge

Dated: November 7, 2008

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on November 7, 2008.

s/Tracy A. Jacobs
TRACY A. JACOBS